

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for his remaining 30 seconds.

Mr. DICKS. I just will wrap this up.

I would say, you know, it's very unusual to say you support a program or support the arts when you offer an amendment to eliminate the entire program. It's like saying I'm for the B-2 bomber but I want to vote against it. You can't have it both ways. Either you're for the arts or you're not. When you're here, you have to demonstrate that support by supporting the program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CANNON

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON:

At end of bill add:

SEC. _____. None of the funds in this Act may be used to implement section ____ of this bill (relating to oil-shale leasing) in the States of Utah or Wyoming.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 26, 2007, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would limit the effects of the amendment by my colleagues from Colorado to Colorado.

I am deeply troubled by my colleagues' zeal to stop oil shale leasing and development in the West. Oil shale is not a new idea. In fact, the lands in question were once part of a strategic reserve. Rather than limiting our energy resources, I am offering this amendment in an attempt to make sure that Americans have the opportunity to be energy independent and to create more American jobs.

Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming hold a conservative estimate of 2 trillion barrels of recoverable oil in the Green River Formation. We have one or two times the total crude oil reserves of the whole world and triple the amount of oil reserves in Saudi Arabia. Two trillion barrels of oil is enough to meet

current U.S. demands for hundreds of years.

At a time when the price of consumer goods and services are soaring in large part because of the cost of energy resources, why would we intentionally hinder our ability to develop our most promising resource? It is no secret that the environmental community does not want shale development to succeed in this Nation, but we have environmental laws that are designed to protect our Federal lands. If those laws are not sufficient, let's talk about those issues as opposed to simply putting up roadblocks to this promising resource. Increased global demands, skyrocketing energy prices, geopolitical instability, concerns about peak oil production and supplies are all economic factors that we believe make oil shale an attractive natural resource to help solve our country's dependency problems.

The U.S. and world demand for oil is increasing, and we will not be able to conserve our way out of this dilemma. We must as a country look to other sources of energy. Many experts agree that oil shale in Utah can be a major part of the solution. Issues regarding environmental and community impact will need to be addressed at a local, State and Federal level and also by private industry. I believe Utah and the region can look to Canada's oil sands to see what other countries have done to develop their resources and the benefits that come with such development. Canada has invested vastly in oil sands and has seen a huge return in royalties. Oil sands are now a \$20 billion-per-year industry in a remote area of Canada.

We cannot leave our constituents holding the bag on higher energy prices. Development of oil shale as well as oil, gas and renewable energy technologies will lighten the load of our constituents. Successful development of oil shale can help solve the Nation's energy dilemma and also bring millions and eventually billions of dollars to the Federal Treasury, Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming through royalties and mineral lease moneys.

We have heard that we need to be energy independent. How, then, can we criticize the BLM for moving forward in helping us achieve this goal? We should be encouraging the responsible development of oil shale so that we can in part fulfill our desire to keep from relying on foreign and often unstable nations for our energy resources. These are nations that hate us and who use our American dollars to hurt our interests.

I would encourage my colleagues to support the amendment and resist the urge to destroy the potential of oil shale before it is developed. I would encourage my colleagues to support my amendment to allow States that want to develop oil shale, that they be allowed to develop that oil shale.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. This amendment is a mistake. There are plenty of reasons to delay the oil shale leasing which the BLM is doing. The Governor of Colorado and several other local Members of Congress have also asked for an appropriate delay so the public can fully understand the ramifications of massive oil shale leasing. Furthermore, the large-scale demonstration projects have begun and it is far too soon for large-scale commercial leasing.

To give the companies time to learn from the demonstrations, I think we should defeat this amendment and stay with the Udall amendment. What this does is basically overturn the Udall amendment, which is pending at this time.

I urge opposition to the Cannon amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington withdraw his point of order?

Mr. DICKS. I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the gentleman for withdrawing his point of order and would point out, I understand that the Governor of Colorado, a Democrat, has decided that he doesn't want oil shale development in Colorado and my Democratic colleagues have opposed oil shale development in Colorado. It is true that in Colorado there are major projects that are underway and that have begun with some small-scale demonstration projects. That is fine for Colorado. It does not make sense for America to impose on Utah and Wyoming the same concerns that the Democratic leadership of Colorado wants to have in Colorado. And so I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment. The fact is I think, having looked at the industry, the likelihood of significant oil shale development, oil coming out of shale, is more likely to be from entrepreneurial sources that are not dependent upon these vast, vast projects that are being done in Colorado.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Do you want us to all vote for the Udall amendment so that your amendment can repeal it?

Mr. CANNON. No, no. If the Udall amendment passes, then my amendment would become irrelevant. But I think under the rules of the body today, we were not able to do a second-degree amendment which is what I would have preferred. That being the case, the fact is Colorado has expressed itself I think pretty clearly here today that they don't want this development and, in fact, the case is different in Colorado than it is in Utah. I think that the opportunity for entrepreneurial development of oil shale should not be inhibited by frivolous government regulations. We have laws in place. In Utah,